

In response to the Office Action mailed on August 1, 2001, Applicant offers the following amendment and response to office action, and requests reconsideration of the above-captioned application. This response addresses every ground of rejection set forth in the Office Action.

### AMENDMENTS

#### Kindly amend the Claims

3. (As Amended) A heat pipe having at least a portion of a wall thereof formed from diamond material through which at least a portion of heat flowing between a heat source and a heat pipe passes wherein the heat source is an electronic device.

4. (As Amended) A heat pipe having multiple diamond elements through which at least a portion of heat flowing between a heat source and a heat pipe passes, wherein the heat source is electronic devices.

5. (As Amended) A heat pipe having at least one diamond element through which at least a portion of heat flowing between a heat source and a heat pipe passes, the heat pipe functioning to improve thermal uniformity within the heat source.

6. (As Amended) A heat pipe having multiple diamond elements through which at least a portion of heat flowing between a heat source and a heat pipe passes, the heat pipe functioning to improve thermal uniformity within and among the heat sources.

#### Kindly add to the Claims

17. A heat pipe having a diamond wall through which at least a portion of heat flowing into or out of the heat pipe passes.
18. A heat pipe having a diamond wall through which at least a portion of heat flowing into
19. or out of the heat pipe passes, wherein the heat sources are electronic devices.
20. heat pipe having a diamond wall through which at least a portion of heat flowing into or out of the heat pipe passes, the principal function of the heat pipe being to improve thermal uniformity within the heat source.
21. A heat pipe having a diamond wall through which at least a portion of heat flowing into or out of the heat pipe passes, the principal function of the heat pipe being to improve thermal uniformity within and among the heat sources.

**REMARKS IN REGARD TO CLAIM REJECTION-35 USC § 112**

The Examiner rejected claims 3-6 under 35 USC 112 first paragraph. The Examiner indicates that the recitations in claims 3-6, "the heat source", "the heat sources" and "the principal function" lack antecedence. Applicant has amended the claim to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for identifying these errors. Accordingly, the Applicant believes the claims are now in a condition for allowance.

**REMARKS IN REGARD TO CLAIM REJECTION-35 USC § 102**